

Crippling consumer electronics devices - in this case HDTV receivers - is a misguided attempt to protect intellectual property. Digital Audio Tape (DAT) is just one very good example of how this approach has led to the destruction of very good consumer technologies in the past. This approach has also created massive consumer electronics market inefficiencies, leading to increased cost of, and decreased convenience derived from, consumer electronics devices.

Copy protection schemes are doomed to fail, even in a "trusted" computing environment. This has been proven, over and over again.

The attempt to enact the current change (Docket 02-230) is misguided because one industry is asking that an entire generation (or more) of a consumer electronic device be crippled, simply to protect its property. The end result means *\*less\** choice for consumers, and *\*less\** competition in what should be a free marketplace for products and ideas.

Further, how will this effect broadcasters who *\*want\** consumers to copy their content? Certainly, as the costs of content production and distribution continue to decrease at exponential rates, many entrants to the digital content arena will distribute free content to leverage other services and advertising.

Why should a small group of content producers control the future of HDTV content production and distribution? The proposed rule change will help promote just this scenario, keeping American consumers in the digital dark ages for years to come, and controlled by the lack of imagination, and outright greed of a few corporations.

The current small number of content producers think that they have all the content that we will ever need. They're wrong; American consumers will vote with their pocketbooks for those companies that consistently produce the best content, for the most people, at the cheapest cost. This is the ultimate promise of digital technology: more, for less, for *\*everyone\** (not just a few content distributors).